

**Historic District Review Committee
Staff Report
Date of Meeting: August 8, 2011
CAPP2011-0008
Historic District: Goose Creek
Project Planner: Lauren Murphy**

Action Item

CAPP 2011-0008 Murley: Demolition of Existing Garage and Construction of New Garage. PIN # 455-38-3143.

Background



Figure 1: Subject Property, 18165 Sands Road

The subject property is located at 18165 Sands Road in the Goose Creek Historic District. The demolition of the existing one-car garage and construction of a new two-car garage is proposed with this Certificate of Appropriateness (CAPP) application.

The property is assessed at approximately .46 acres. The primary building on the lot is a 1940's stucco Cape Cod with dormers. The existing garage is not visible on the County mapping system but is located to the north of the existing dwelling and is approximately 240 square feet¹.



Photo 1: Subject Property, general area of garage as viewed from Sands Road

¹ Based on data from the Loudoun County Real Estate, Tax Assessment and Parcel Database

At the May 9, 2011 meeting, the HDRC deferred action on the proposed garage citing that the scale and mass of the garage was not consistent with the existing house, the surrounding historic district or the Historic District Guidelines. At the meeting the HDRC offered the applicant several suggestions to bring the proposed garage into compliance with the Guidelines. These suggestions included but were not limited to:

1. Relocating the structure to the rear of the property as far as possible
2. Modulating the façade through the use of different materials/textures to help break up the mass of the structure.
3. Removing the exposed pipe chimney.
4. Investigating the possibility of repairing the existing structure.
5. Redesigning the proposed building to reflect more common accessory buildings of this mass and scale (such as a barn).

On July 8, 2011, the applicant submitted revised elevations and a revised statement of justification. The garage location has not been changed since the last meeting. The dimensions of the garage have been slightly reduced.

According to the zoning referral letter dated July 25, 2011, there are no zoning issues with this application.

Analysis

This application is evaluated under the Historic District Guidelines: Goose Creek (“Goose Creek Guidelines” or “Guidelines”), Chapter 4, *Guidelines for New Construction*, and Chapter 3, *Guidelines for Site Elements*, with references to Chapter 7, *Guidelines for Materials*, and Chapter 10, *Guidelines for Demolition and Moving*, where appropriate.

I. Demolition of Existing Garage:

The garage is constructed of cinderblock with wood siding in the gable ends. The roof is sheathed with asphalt shingles and the structure rests on a concrete slab. The date of construction on the existing garage is not known. The house was constructed in the 1940s (based on the assessment records) and it is possible, although not formally determined, that the garage was constructed around the same time (mid 20th century). The applicant’s statement of justification (SOJ) indicates that the existing garage is structurally unsound and in disrepair.



Photo 2: Existing Garage

The Guidelines for Demolition provide the HDRC with 13 criteria to consider when reviewing applications for demolition (Goose Creek Guidelines, *Guidelines for Demolition and Moving*, Demolition, page 146, Demolition Criteria). The existing garage was built in the mid-20th century and may be considered a contributing structure to the

historic district given its age. However, given the mid 20th century date of construction, the construction method and materials and its deteriorating condition, it is unlikely that demolition of the garage will significantly impact the existing dwelling or the character of the Goose Creek District. The request is generally consistent with the Guidelines for Demolition. Staff notes that the mass and scale of the existing garage is more consistent with the Guidelines and more in keeping with the scale of the house and surrounding accessory buildings than the proposed garage.

II. Construction of New Garage:

The Guidelines state that historic outbuildings should be retained and repaired (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements, Accessory Structures and Breezeways, page 46, Guideline 1). However, as indicated above, demolition of the existing garage may be appropriate.

A. Building Placement & Massing:

The proposed garage is detached from the main dwelling, which is the preferred design for garages in the Goose Creek District (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements, Accessory Structures and Breezeways, page 46, Guideline 3a). However, given the mass and placement of the new garage, it will not be discernible from the road as a separate building (see sheet A-2 of the revised drawings). While the applicant has slightly reduced the width of the garage from the first submission, the proposed structure continues to challenge the mass of the existing building. The HDRC may wish to view the proposed garage as an addition to the existing structure rather than as an accessory structure. The Guidelines state that where accessory garages are included in a structure “its doors should not face the right-of-way and [it] should be screened from view” (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements, Accessory Structures and Breezeways, page 46, Guideline 3c). As detached garages are the preference of the Guidelines and the prevailing condition of most garages in Lincoln, staff continues to evaluate the proposed garage as a detached building. It is also unlikely that the currently proposed garage could be rotated to shield the doors from view and would still need to be reduced in mass and scale in order to meet the Guidelines for attached garages.



Figure 2: Aerial View of Property

The Guidelines indicate that accessory structures should be “subordinate to the main historic structure in scale, mass, and siting” (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements, Accessory Structures and Breezeways, page 46, Guideline 2). The new

garage will be sited behind the house, approximately ten feet further from the road than the existing garage. The location of the garage to the side of the house follows a linear plan (perpendicular) for building arrangement which meets the Guidelines (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements, Building Placement, page 42, text).

The proposed property is within the Lincoln Village Conservation Overlay District (LVCOD). The Guidelines state that new garages should be “*to the rear of village lots that are large enough to accommodate them, following the applicable zoning requirements*” (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements, Accessory Structures and Breezeways, page 47, Guideline 4). While the new garage is ten feet further from the road than the existing garage, the new garage will be significantly larger than the current building (with the slight reduction in width, the proposed garage is still almost three times the size of the current structure) and is located only five feet from the nearest side property line. The garage would have less visual impact from Sands Road if it were located further back towards the rear of the lot. The siting of the garage was an issue of concern during the HDRC meeting on May 9, 2011. **While the applicant has amended the garage design, the siting has not been altered with this submission. Staff recommends that the proposed garage remain detached but with the caveat that the garage is relocated as far to the rear of the lot as possible in order to remain consistent with the Guidelines.**

The gable end of the proposed garage will face Sands Road which will help to reduce the perceived mass of the structure from the street. However, the massing of the proposed garage is disproportionate to the scale of the modest house which does not help to establish the garage as a subordinate structure (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements, Accessory Structures and Breezeways, page 46, Guideline 2). The garage remains 32 feet deep, which is deeper than the main block of the house (approximately 28 feet deep), and 22 feet wide (reduced from the previously submitted 24 feet wide), which is almost as wide as the main block of the house (approximately 34 feet wide). The garage remains approximately 16.5 feet tall and the existing house is approximately 23.5 feet tall. The substantial proportions of the garage continue to increase the perceived mass of the structure when compared to the dwelling. The scale and mass of the proposed building also continues to be out of character with other accessory structures in the Village of Lincoln. **To be more consistent with the Guidelines and to reduce the visible mass of the garage, Staff continues to recommend a reduction in the scale and massing of the garage, to be more consistent with the existing structure, in order to thoroughly establish this as a subordinate and accessory building. The proportions of the existing garage are more consistent with the scale and mass of the house as well as the surrounding Village of Lincoln.**

B. Roof Form and Materials:

The proposed garage has a gable roof form which is the preferred roof form in the Goose Creek District (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Roof Form and Materials, page 66, Guideline 1). The pitch of the garage is proposed to

match the pitch of the kitchen addition (five-in-twelve) which is not a typical roof pitch found in the Goose Creek District. The existing house has a twelve-in-twelve roof pitch which is more common (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Roof Form and Materials, page 66, Guideline 2). The shallower pitch proposed for the garage was discussed in a pre-application meeting with the project architect who has indicated that the use of a steeper roof pitch matching the main block was investigated but was eventually replaced with the shallower roof to avoid increasing the height of the structure and further impacting the adjacent neighbor. The lower roof pitch, while uncommon in the District, will match the existing kitchen area. Given the large mass of the structure, the additional height necessary for a steeper roof pitch would only add prominence to the structure and increase the massing which is not supported by the Guidelines (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Roof Form and Materials, page 66, Inappropriate Treatment 1). However, if the mass of the structure were further reduced, an alternative roof pitch more in keeping with the District would be possible.



Photo 3: Roof Pitch at Kitchen Addition

The roof on the existing house is sheathed in asphalt shingles. While asphalt is not a preferred roofing material, the Guidelines do recognize that it may be appropriate in certain cases provided that the shingles are “*dark [and] consistently colored*” (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Roof Form and Materials, page 66, Guideline 3c). The Guidelines state that accessory buildings should be “*compatible with the style and character of the primary building on site*” while also remaining subordinate to the main structure (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements, Accessory Structures and Breezeways, page 46, Guideline 2 and page 47, Guideline 5). While standing seam metal, wood/slate shingles or cement shingles that approximate wood/slate are generally preferred, the use of one of these more traditional roofing materials on the accessory garage would give the building dominance over the primary structure. **Therefore, the continuation of asphalt shingles on the accessory structure is appropriate provided that they are dark and consistently colored as indicated in the Guidelines.**

C. Chimney:

The applicant desires to heat the new garage with a woodstove. The Guidelines do not anticipate chimneys for accessory garages but do provide general guidance which can be applied to this proposal. The chimney is located on the rear gable end set on a concrete block base, painted to match the foundation on the kitchen. The rear elevation of the garage will not be visible from Sands Road but at least three feet of the chimney will be visible over the peak of the roof at a distance of approximately 92 feet from the public road. The proposed chimney for the woodstove will be an exposed metal pipe, painted black, which is in direct conflict with Guidelines for chimneys: “*Do not use*

exterior metal pipe chimneys” (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Chimneys, page 68, Inappropriate Treatment 1). Staff notes that a garage on the adjacent property also has an exposed metal chimney. The base of the chimney is evaluated below with the foundation of the garage.

The Guidelines state that chimneys should be constructed of “*locally available fieldstone or brick*” (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Chimneys, page 68, Guideline 1). A more traditional and substantial masonry chimney would be in keeping with the Guidelines for chimneys but would also add to the prominence of the accessory structure. Given the mass of the garage in comparison with the modest house (which does not have a chimney) a masonry chimney on this accessory building is not consistent with the Guidelines for accessory structures. **At the May 8, 2011 meeting, the HDRC recommended the removal of the exposed pipe chimney. The proposed chimney is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff continues to recommend removal of the chimney.**

D. Doors and Windows:

The proposed garage will have two double hung six-over-six windows (one on the “south” elevation and one on the “north” elevation). The six-over-six style is common in the Goose Creek District and will match the existing windows on the house (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Doors Windows and Shutters, page 70, text and graphics). The Guidelines state that windows should have true divided lites or “interior and exterior fixed muntins with internal spacers” (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Doors Windows and Shutters, page 73, Guideline 9). The proposed windows will have simulated divided lites, which meets the Guidelines for fixed interior and exterior muntins (provided that an integral spacer bar is utilized). The SOJ indicates that the windows will be wood to match the existing windows on the house. Wood is the preferred material for windows in the Goose Creek District (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Doors Windows and Shutters, page 73, Guideline 10). **The double hung windows meet the Guidelines for windows on new construction.**



Photo 4: Existing Windows, Kitchen Addition

The revised elevations show one roll-up garage door on the front (east) elevation in lieu of the previously proposed double doors. The reduction in the number of garage doors on the front elevation assists in reducing the perceived mass of the structure; however the proposed single garage door is 12 feet wide rather than the previously submitted eight feet wide door. The side-entry door, previously proposed on the south elevation, has been relocated to the front elevation. The door is insulated metal with two raised panels on the lower half of the door and nine lites on the upper half. The entry door of the new garage, while not typical of older homes in the Goose Creek District, matches

the existing front entry door on the house, built in the mid 20th century. The relocation of the entry door to the front elevation does articulate this façade, however, the location is atypical of other accessory buildings more commonly found in the district such as carriage houses or barns. The south side location was less visible from Sands Road but, the design of the proposed door is consistent with the existing front entry into the house and the HDRC may find it appropriate on the front façade of the garage.

The elevations indicate that the garage door on the east elevation, visible from Sands Road, will be Amarr Garage Doors – Classica Collection. The proposed doors have 24 recessed panels each with inset simulated bead-board as well as carriage handles and strap hinges. While the currently proposed door is simpler than the originally proposed door (which also had windows with divided lights), the increase door width has resulted in an increased number of recessed panels (formerly 12). This proposed door style remains inconsistent with the otherwise simple garage design, the existing house, or the Quaker style of Lincoln. A simplified door (which could continue the use of strap hinges, similar to the existing door) would be more compatible with



Photo 5: Existing Garage Doors

the style of the garage and the existing house, in keeping with the Guidelines for accessory structures (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Site Elements, Accessory Structures and Breezeways, page 47, Guideline 5). A wide variety of door styles are available that would be more in keeping with the character of the property and surrounding village. The HDRC may wish to have additional discussion about the garage door design at the August meeting as this door will occupy the majority of the front elevation.

The Guidelines state that wood is the preferred material for doors but that composite products may be considered in new construction (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Doors Windows and Shutters, page 72, Guideline 7). While a composite product is preferred over metal, a steel door is preferable to materials such as vinyl and the HDRC may approve alternative materials on new construction projects when the proposed material “*replicates the visual qualities and workability of the original material*” (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Materials and Textures, page 80, Guideline 9).

A steel sectional door is still proposed for the rear of the garage. This door will not be visible from the public right-of-way and is a more simple design, without carriage details. While wood remains the preferred material, the use of steel on this door may be appropriate because the door will not be visible from the public road.

E. Foundation:

The applicant’s SOJ indicates that the foundation of the proposed structure and the base of the chimney will be concrete masonry block. The Guidelines state that concrete

blocks should not be used (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Foundations, page 76, Inappropriate Treatment 2). The existing kitchen addition also has exposed, painted concrete block. The foundation of the main block of the house is not visible. Although neither the majority of the foundation nor the base of the chimney will be visible from Sands Road, a parged base for the chimney and any exposed foundation would be more in keeping with the Guidelines (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Foundations, page 76, Guideline 7). **Staff continues to recommend a condition of approval requiring the parging of the foundation and chimney base in order to meet the Guidelines.**

F. Materials:

- a. Siding – the proposed siding material is Hardieplank. The color and reveal (10 inches) will match the existing kitchen which is the nearest portion of the existing structure to the garage. The Guidelines indicate a preference for wood siding but do acknowledge that cementitious products, like Hardieplank, may be appropriate on new construction projects (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Materials and Textures, page 80, Guidelines 2 and 7). The Guidelines state that a “*five-inch to seven-inch reveal*” is in keeping with historic precedents (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Materials and Textures, page 80, Guideline 7). The proposed 10 inch reveal is outside of this historic range but is already on use on the existing structure and a smaller reveal will increase the amount of siding needed which may result in adding to the mass of the structure, rather than camouflaging it.
- b. Trim – the SOJ indicates that the wall trim for the doors and windows will match the existing house. The SOJ also indicates that a composite material will be used. While the Guidelines support wood as the preferred material for trim work, the composite product is acceptable if it can emulate wood (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for Materials, Composite Trim Materials, page 133, Guideline 2). Because of the mass of the garage and the pitch of the roof, it is likely that gutters and downspouts will be needed. While these are not shown on the elevations, staff recommends a condition of approval to require any gutters and downspouts match those on the existing house (half round, black).
- c. Roof – the proposed roofline will match the five-in-twelve pitch of the existing kitchen. The proposed asphalt shingles will match the existing roof. While asphalt is not a preferred material for roofing, the Guidelines do indicate that the HDRC may approve asphalt shingles in some cases (Goose Creek Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction, Roof Form and Material, page 66, Guideline 3c).

Findings

1. The applicant desires to demolish the existing one-car garage and replace it with a larger two-car garage in the same general location. The exact age of the

garage is unknown, though it appears to be mid 20th century construction. Demolition of the garage is generally consistent with the Guidelines and will not significantly impact the Goose Creek District or the property. However, the proportions of the existing garage are more consistent with the house and surrounding accessory structures than the proposed building and would be more compatible with the Guidelines.

2. The massing of the proposed garage is not significantly subordinate to the size of the dwelling which does not meet the Guidelines for accessory structures. While the applicant has reduced the garage width by two feet, the proportions continue to challenge the modest house and other accessory buildings in Lincoln.
3. The pitch of the proposed roof (five-in-twelve) is not a common roof pitch in the Goose Creek District but will match the pitch of an addition to the existing house. A steeper pitch would create a taller roofline and would increase the height and massing of the structure which would not meet the Guidelines. However, if the massing of the structure were reduced, a more common roof pitch could be utilized without adding significant height.
4. The proposed roof material is consistent with the existing structure and is appropriate for the accessory building provided that the asphalt shingles are consistently colored.
5. The exposed metal pipe chimney does not meet the Guidelines for chimneys. However, the Guidelines anticipate chimneys for primary structures rather than accessory buildings. Also, a masonry chimney on the large accessory building would add to the prominence of the garage and would not meet the Guidelines for accessory structures.
6. The proposed six-over-six double hung windows are consistent with the Guidelines for windows and will match the windows on the existing structure. The proposed side-entry door will also match the doors on the existing structure.
7. The proposed garage door on the front elevation is not in keeping with the style of the existing house. A more simplified door with limited elements of a carriage style such as strap hinges and handles would be more in keeping with the District and the house. The use of steel doors is preferable to vinyl and will emulate wood when viewed from Sands Road which meets the Guidelines for materials.
8. The proposed concrete block foundation does not meet the Guidelines for foundations and should be parged rather than painted.
9. The Hardieplank siding and composite trim meet the Guidelines for materials on new construction.

Recommendation

At the May 9th meeting, the HDRC provided the applicant with multiple suggestions to reduce the perceived mass and scale of the proposed garage. The revised submission does not address any of those recommendations. The current design in the current location is not consistent with the Guidelines and staff is therefore unable to recommend approval of the current location and design. However, if the applicant agrees to relocate the proposed structure to the rear of the lot, the perceived mass of the structure would be significantly reduced and would therefore

be more consistent with the Guidelines. In this case, staff would offer the following recommendations to bring the design of the structure into conformance with the Guidelines:

1. The proposed foundation should be parged
2. The exposed metal pipe chimney should be eliminated

Suggested Motions

1. *I move that the Historic District Review Committee approve Certificate of Appropriateness 2011-0008 for the demolition of the existing one-car garage and construction of a new two-car garage in accordance with the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines for the Goose Creek Historic and Cultural Conservation District based on the findings included on page 9 and 10 of the staff report dated August 8, 2011 as submitted in the application.*
2. *I move that the Historic District Review Committee approve Certificate of Appropriateness 2011-0008 for the demolition of the existing one-car garage and construction of a new two-car garage in accordance with the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines for the Goose Creek Historic and Cultural Conservation District based on the findings included on page 9 and 10 of the staff report dated August 8, 2011 with the following conditions ...*
3. *I move an alternative motion.*